King Emperor··· ··· ... ...". When we deal with a Proclamation issued by His Highness, any discussion of that would necessarily involve considerations like the one that I already referred to. The propriety or otherwise of His Highness' actions cannot be discussed in this House. Besides I would also submit that the reservation of certain legislative and other powers with His Highness the Maharaja should necessarily mean that action taken by His Highness in pursuance of those powers would transcend the powers conferred on or the scope of this Council. Whatever His Highness may have done by Proclamation should never be a matter for discussion or comment in this Council.

Mr. President:—If a Regulation or Proclamation is issued by His Highness the Maharaja, cannot a Member table a motion in this House for amending or repealing it?

Mr. Thomas Manjuran:—Here it is a Proclamation that has been issued. There is some difference.

Mr. President.—I think the position is quite clear. So far as the right of an Hon'ble Member to move an adjournment motion is concerned, we have to confine ourselves to the provisions contained in the Regulation, Rules and Standing Orders. Rule 19 coupled with Rule 34 prescribes the limitations imposed upon the right of a Member with regard to adjournment motions. With regard to Rule 25 (3) to which the Law Member referred, it is up to the Chair to see that no reflection is cast on the conduct of His Highness. That will be for the Chair to watch. I do not find anywhere in the Regulation, Rules or Standing Orders that a Regulation which has been passed by His Highness as a Proclamation cannot form the subject matter of an adjournment at all. Unless there is specific provision I think any Hon'ble Member has a right to move to adjourn the business of the Council on this matter. I rule that the adjournment motion is in order. But objection having been taken I would take the sense of the House. Those who are for will kindly stand up in their seats.

The Adjournment motion was lost for want of the prescribed minimum number of Members supporting it.

iii. Delay in the disposal of the Cochin Tenancy Regulation Amendment Bill.

Mr. President.—Another adjournment motion tabled by Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan reads thus:—

"I have the honour to give you notice that I intend moving the adjournment of the business of the House for discussing an

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

urgent matter of public importance to wit the hardship and inconvenience experienced by the jenmies and tenants alike in having a good many of their cases kept pending without trial as a sequel to the Tenancy Amendment Bill passed by the Council long ago being not finally disposed of."

The matter must have been of recent occurrence, i. e. it must have arisen between the last sitting of the Council and the present sitting.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—I submit, Sir, it is a matter of recent occurrence in this sense. The legislation under reference having been passed long ago and that fact being brought to the notice of the Government by questions it is still kept pending and any decision upon that Bill not having come up even today either in the shape of assent or dissent, I would submit that in that view it is a matter of recent occurrence. The recent occurrence may be one of commission or omission. It is also a matter of continuing urgency because we expect the Bill either to be assented or dissented by His Highness within a reasonable period the former more than the latter after it was passed by this House. More than 3 years have now elapsed since this Bill was passed by this Council and a large number of suits are pending trial. Hence the subject under consideration is one of recent occurrence.

Mr. President.—I am sure the Hon'ble Member has not justified his case at all. It is a very well known interpretation of that rule that the incident must be one which has recently occurred between the last sitting of the Council and this sitting. But I may give a tip to the Hon'ble Member. In such cases what is generally done is a question is asked and on the ground that the answer is unsatisfactory an adjournment motion can be moved. That is how old grievances are raked up.

The motion was ruled out of order.

iv. Legalising of giving Credit slips instead of cash to sellers of arecanuts.

Mr. President.—The next one is also in the name of Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan. It reads thus:—

"I have the honour to give you notice that I intend moving an adjournment of the business of the House to discuss an urgent matter of public importance to wit 'the legalising of giving credit slips instead of cash to sellers of arecanuts' as notified in the Government Gezette dated 3rd Karkitagom 1111."

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly